

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on January 23, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 5-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,578,812 to Yui; rejected claims 7 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui; allowed claims 1-4 and objected to claims 13-17.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 5-12. In making the rejection, the Examiner equates the claimed controller with controller 80 of Yui shown in Figure 9. In addition, the Examiner equates the claimed first, second, third and fourth memories with line memories 82, 84, 86 and 88 of Yui also shown in Figure 9. The Examiner then goes on to equate the claimed input address bus and output address bus with Yui's busses between the line memories and the write controller 90 and the line memories and read controller 92, respectively. This is not what is claimed.

Claim 5 recites one controller. The Examiner cannot equate Yui's controller 80 AND Yui's read and write circuits 90 and 92 with the single claimed controller.

In addition, the input and output address buses as presently claimed are in a different configuration to the write bus and read bus of Yui. Controller 80, as cited to by the Examiner, is not even coupled to the write and read buses of Yui. Thus, in order to try and make Yui anticipate the claims, the Examiner must switch from controller 80 to write and read circuits 90 and 92. This switching from one part of Yui to another shows that Yui does not anticipate claim 5.

In rejecting claim 6, the Examiner then refers to Yui's Figure 6. Figure 6, however, is not a part of Figure 9. Rather Figure 6 and Figure 9 are two alternative

circuits disclosed by Yui. More specifically, Figure 9 is modified to be different in structure than Figures 5 and 6. See column 10, lines 25-29. Thus, the multiplexers shown by Yui in Figure 6 are not used in Yui's Figure 9. Since the Examiner relies on Figure 9 to reject the base claim 5, it follows the Examiner cannot then rely on Figure 6 to reject dependent claim 6.

With respect to claims 9-12, the Examiner takes Official Notice that what is claimed therein is "old and well known in the art." Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide a reference showing these claimed elements.

Even if what is claimed in claims 9-12 was well known in the art, the motivation to combine those teachings with Yui is simply not provided. The Examiner alleges that the proposed combination will "increase accura[cy] in controlling the memories." Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide support for the assertion that Yui alone is less accurate than the proposed combination.

Claims not specifically mentioned above are allowable due to their dependency on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

No fees beyond the fees for the Petition for the One (1) Month Extension of Time are due for this response. However, the Office is authorized to charge any additional fees or underpayments of fees (including fees for petitions for extensions of time) under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 to account number 502117. Any overpayments should be credited to the same account.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application, withdrawal of the rejection made in the last Office Action and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. The Applicant's representative can be reached at the below telephone number if the Examiner has any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Cucinotta

_____/Benjamin D. Driscoll/_____
Benjamin D. Driscoll
Reg. No. 41,571
Motorola, Inc.
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
P (215) 323-1840
F (215) 323-1300

____May 23, 2007____
Date